

Institutional Handbook

for

Program Approval

Adopted December 1, 1998



Kansas State Department of Education

Kansas State Education Building
120 S.E. 10th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

- Within quartiles, institutions will be listed alphabetically

Quartile I

- highest pass rates

Quartile II

- second highest pass rates

Quartile III

- third highest pass rates

Quartile IV

- lowest pass rates

Focus on Pass Rates

- Cohort of program completers for the most recent academic year
 - program completer is a person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program

Focus on Pass Rates

- Include tests taken by completers that are:
 - within the completer's area of specialization
 - taken within 5 years prior to program completion
 - taken by the test closure date

Focus on Pass Rates

- Calculate only when a minimum of 10 program completers have taken the assessment

Focus on Pass Rates

- If an individual takes the same test more than once, the highest score should be used
- Pass rates are not calculated for individuals who are preparing to become any of the non-teaching professionals in schools
 - ex: guidance counselors

Single Assessment Pass Rates

- The proportion of program completers who passed the assessment among all who took the assessment
 - numerator, number who passed the assessment
 - denominator, total number who took the assessment

Single Assessment Pass Rates

- Calculated for:
 - the one assessment in the Professional Knowledge test
 - each of the three assessments included in the PPST
 - Math
 - Reading
 - Writing

Aggregate Pass Rates

- The proportion of program completers who passed all the tests they took in a skill/knowledge area, among all program completers who took one or more tests in this area
 - numerator, number who passed **all** the assessments that they took
 - denominator, total number who took one or more assessments in this area

Aggregate Pass Rates

- Categories Calculated for:
 - Basic Skills (PPST)
 - Professional Knowledge and Pedagogy (Professional Knowledge/PLT)

Summary Pass Rate

- The proportion of program completers who passed all tests they took for their areas of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization area
 - numerator, number who passed **all** tests they took for their areas of specialization
 - denominator, the number who took one or more tests in their specialization area

Within an assessment category

- If an individual takes one or more assessments and **passes all assessments taken**, then he/she is counted as a **PASS**
- If an individual takes one or more assessments and **fails one or more**, then he/she is counted as a **FAIL**

Data Collection Formats

- Excel Spreadsheet
 - diskette
 - electronic transmission
- Web Application

To Do List for KSDE

- Define Academic Year
 - ex: July 1- June 30
- Define the Closure Date
 - ex: September 1
- Establish Reporting Method Process
- Establish a resolution process for disagreements about pass rate computations

- Establish criteria for defining low-performing teacher education programs
- Establish and confirm list of subject areas of specialization for each institution

To Do List for Institutions

- Assess data resources
- Establish new databases, if necessary

Read more about Title II

www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/News/index.html

Program Completer

- A person who is documented as having met the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program
 - recommendation for state certification may NOT be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer

- Program completion can include passing all the tests for state certification ONLY IF
 - an individual must pass all the tests before receiving a degree or other proof of having met the program's requirements.

Program Completer

- Documentation may include:
 - degree
 - institutional certificate
 - transcript
 - other written proof

Quartile Rankings

- Calculated for:
 - aggregate pass rates (2)
 - summary pass rate
- Rounded to the nearest whole percent
 - 98.49% reported as 98%
 - 98.50% reported as 99%
 - 99.50% reported as 100%

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
OVERVIEW.....	5
Accreditation.....	5
Approval of Programs.....	6
Visits to Off-Campus Sites and Programs	7
PROGRAM APPROVAL.....	9
Renewal Of Approved Programs.....	9
The Self-Study	9
Intent to Seek Renewal of Approved Teacher Education Program Form.....	9
Institutional Folios.....	9
Suggestions For Preparing Folios	11
Submitting Folios.....	12
Folio Review Team Members.....	12
Conflicts of Interest.....	12
Ethical Guidelines for Institutions.....	13
Folio Review Procedures.....	13
Institutional Rejoinder to the Team Report.....	14
Program Approval Decisions	16
Program Approval Status.....	17
Upgrade Reports for Approved with Stipulation Programs	17
Section I Description of the Program.....	17
Section II Supporting Documentation Applicable to Revisions or Weaknesses.....	18
Guidelines For Student Completion Of Unapproved Programs.....	18

Guidelines for Student Completion of Approved Programs When Unit Accreditation is Revoked.....	19
Guidelines for Matching Accreditation and Program Approval Cycles.....	19
Action Letter and Report	19
NEW PROGRAMS	21
The Self-Study	21
Folios for New Programs.....	21
Section I Preliminary Information.....	22
Section II Program Descriptions.....	22
New Program Team Members.....	23
Folio Review Procedures for New Programs	23
Institutional Rejoinder to the Team Report.....	24
Program Approval Decisions	25
Action Letter and Report	25
Program Approval Status.....	25
New Program Procedures Following Initial Approval	26
Operationalizing a program	26
Progress Reports for New Programs.....	26
Section I Description of the Program.....	26
Section II Supporting Documentation Applicable to Revisions or Weaknesses.....	27
Innovative or Experimental Program Procedures.....	27
ANNUAL REPORTS.....	29
APPENDICES.....	31
Appendix A.....	33
Unit Accreditation (Initial).....	33
Appendix B.....	34
Unit Accreditation (Continuing).....	34
Appendix C.....	35
Folio Review Process for Renewal of Programs	35

Appendix D.....	36
New Program Review Process	36
Appendix E.....	37
Institutional Checklist for Folio Review.....	37
Appendix F.....	38
Program Folio Review Procedures	38
Appendix G.....	41
Intent to Seek Renewal of Approved Teacher Education Programs.....	41
Appendix H.....	46
Course Syllabus Content Helpful to a Review Team and/or the ERC	46
Appendix I.....	47
Sample Standards Matrix (91-1-91 English)	47
Appendix J.....	55
Sample Standards Matrix (91-1-140a Reading Specialist).....	55
Appendix K.....	59
Compliance Rating Form.....	59
Appendix L.....	60
Procedures for Review of Programs by the Evaluation Review Committee	60
Appendix M.....	61
Evaluation Review Committee Hearing Procedures.....	61
Appendix N.....	62
Request for Initial Approval of Teacher Education Programs.....	62
Appendix O.....	67
Third-Year Review of Annual Report Data.....	67
DEFINITIONS.....	69
ACRONYMS.....	77

Introduction

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) *Institutional Handbook for Kansas Accreditation* and *Institutional Handbook for Program Approval* are designed to guide teacher education units through the processes of accreditation and program approval. These documents explain the standards and procedures which apply if a unit wishes to seek initial accreditation or continuing accreditation, begin a new program, or renew approved programs. Because the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE or State Board) has adopted the standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), all institutions are advised to use NCATE's *Standards Procedures & Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units* as they prepare for Kansas accreditation. Any institution planning to seek NCATE accreditation, **must** consult NCATE's *Handbook for Institutional Visits* to obtain specific directions and timelines for preparing and submitting required materials. Throughout the following pages, the term "KSDE" and "KSBE" are used. KSBE refers to the Kansas State Board of Education, the state agency responsible for developing the rules and regulations for accrediting teacher education units and approving programs. KSDE refers to agency staff activities and practices that assist and facilitate the process described in the KSBE rules and regulations.

OVERVIEW

Accreditation

The term "accredited," when applied to initial or continuing accreditation, means the status assigned to a teacher education unit which meets substantially the accreditation standards prescribed in regulations and adopted by the Kansas State Board of Education. NCATE defines accreditation as a process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review. NCATE accreditation informs the public that an institution has a professional education unit that has met national standards of educational quality. A unit that wishes to recommend its students for a license in Kansas must be accredited by the Kansas State Board of Education. Preparing for accreditation requires a minimum of two years and once accreditation is secured, it is continuous, subject to review on a five-year cycle.

The accreditation process focuses on the *professional education unit* that is defined as the administrative body at a college or university that has primary responsibility for the preparation of school personnel. Most institutions identify the unit as the School, College, or Department of Education. Some identify the unit as a coordinating council or other university or college-wide governance agency. Units are administrative agencies that design, manage, and sometimes discontinue programs.

A unit participates in a self-study whether it is seeking initial accreditation or continuing accreditation. The self-study enables the unit to determine its

effectiveness according to unit standards or to determine how well it continues to meet accreditation standards.

In preparation for an initial accreditation visit, the self-study is a process that enables the unit to determine its effectiveness according to unit standards. Unit standards for initial accreditation focus on four categories with a number of indicators within each category. Categories include *The Design of Professional Education*, *Candidates in Professional Education*, *Professional Education Faculty* and *The Unit for Professional Education*. Unit standards do not apply to specific programs. From information revealed through the self-study process, an Institutional Report (IR) is written that describes the unit as it relates to the standards mentioned above. After this report is written, an on-site review team visits the campus to review the professional education unit. The review by this team, summarized in their written report, serves as the basis for determining the accreditation of the unit. In preparing the report for the unit accreditation visit, the institution should focus on the unit and refer to programs only to illustrate how the unit carries out its activities. See Appendix A for a flow chart that demonstrates the process for initial accreditation.

In preparation for a continuing accreditation visit, the self-study focuses on a systematic assessment of how well the unit is continuing to meet NCATE/KSBE standards. Ongoing evaluations and the resulting changes serve as the basis of the continuing accreditation report, which is the primary document for the on-site review every five years. The unit's self-study should be systematic, and not conducted only to prepare for an NCATE/KSDE visit. Regular evaluation activities should encourage faculty to reflect critically on their own practice, and support ongoing reflection and dialogue about the conceptual framework that guides the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. The unit should assess its strengths and weaknesses in carrying out its responsibilities and improving the quality of its programs. Between on-site reviews by NCATE/KSDE, the unit should address the weaknesses cited by the visiting team at the previous review. See Appendix B for a flow chart that demonstrates the process for continuing accreditation.

Approval of Programs

The program approval process focuses on the specific areas that lead to licensure such as mathematics, social studies, or building administrator, etc. Based on a partnership agreement between NCATE and KSDE, the program folios prepared in response to KSBE program standards substitute for NCATE's program description section of the Institutional Report. This places program approval under KSBE regulations and procedures whether the unit is seeking joint NCATE/KSBE accreditation or KSBE accreditation only. Units also may exercise an option to submit folios to the national specialty organizations, (e.g. NCTM, NCTE, etc.).

The unit is expected to coordinate all programs for the initial and continuing preparation of school personnel no matter where they are administratively housed on a campus or at a location apart from the campus. In many institutions, content areas or academic subjects are offered primarily in units other than education (for example, in the College of Arts and Sciences or the School of Agriculture, Business or

Family Sciences). The education unit is held accountable for the quality of these programs as well as those offered within the unit itself.

Program approval falls into two categories--initial approval of new programs and renewal of programs currently approved. All new programs are "approved with stipulation" or "not approved". When a new program is approved with stipulation, those stipulations must be removed by a time set by KSBE. The status assigned to a renewal program is "approved", "approved with stipulation" or "not approved". The assignment of approved status to a teacher education program is usually effective for five academic years. Programs that are "approved with stipulation" are considered to be approved programs but are required to have stipulations removed by a time set by KSBE.

All programs are reviewed through the folio review process. The folio review process is described in greater detail in the following pages. A detailed description of the process for initial approval of teacher education programs and for renewal of teacher education programs can also be found in Regulations 91-1-68e and 91-1-68d of *Certification and Teacher Education Regulations*, Amended September 1997. See Appendices C & D for flow charts that demonstrate the processes for both renewal of previously approved programs and initial approval of programs. Appendix E provides a checklist of the folio review process. Appendix F summarizes the steps in the folio review process.

Visits to Off-Campus Sites and Programs

ALL off-campus sites within the state of Kansas used for the preparation of professional educators for school settings from preschool through twelfth grade shall be part of the institution's professional education unit. These sites will be included as part of any on-site review. Programs at various sites can be considered as one program, as one program with options or as separate programs. It is the responsibility of the unit to determine how the programs are organized. All off-campus sites shall be identified by the unit when it files the "Intent to Seek Unit Accreditation" and the "Intent to Seek Renewal of Approved Teacher Education Programs". Programs and curriculum that differ from the unit's campus site shall be described in the Institutional Report and in the Curriculum Folios which are submitted one year prior to the on-site accreditation visit.

During an accreditation on-site visit, team members will visit one or all of the off-campus sites as determined by the team chair, the unit and KSDE. If the off-campus sites are located geographically distant from the parent institution, representatives of the team may be asked to conduct on-site visits to off-campus programs prior to the scheduled visit to the campus. When possible, the off-campus site administrator, some faculty and some students should be interviewed by the team during the regular on-site review to the campus. If the unit includes several off-campus sites, the number of team members may be increased to provide time for adequate data collection and team deliberations.

Off-campus sites are expected to uphold the same program standards as those of the campus site. If KSBE program standards are not followed in off-campus sites, overall decisions about whether campus program standards are met may be adversely affected. The unit is responsible for covering the travel and maintenance expenses incurred by team members in the conduct of these off-campus visits.

PROGRAM APPROVAL

Renewal Of Approved Programs

The Self-Study

A unit shall conduct a self-study to determine the viability of continuing each of the programs up for renewal. The self-study shall include an examination of the need for each program, the unit's ability to carry out its responsibilities for each program, and the unit's ability to maintain the quality of each program.

There are no specific requirements for the conduct of a self-study, but the involvement of the faculty with responsibility for the professional education core, including those who teach methods courses, appears critical to a successful self-study. Collaboration with faculty in other supporting units is also essential in this process.

Intent to Seek Renewal of Approved Teacher Education Program Form

The Intent to Seek Renewal of Approved Programs form (Appendix G) will be sent to the units by the Teacher Education section of KSDE. The form for renewal of programs must be completed and returned to the Teacher Education Office of the Kansas State Department of Education at least 12 months prior to the expiration of the current approval period. The intent form requests the following information about the institution and professional education unit.

1. Name and address of institution
2. Name and address of the professional education unit
3. Name of the chief executive officer
4. Name of the unit head
5. Name of the contact person (if other than unit head)
6. Type of institution (e.g., private or state)
7. Consortia arrangements (if applicable)
8. Programs for which renewal is sought including grade levels
9. Level of each program (basic or advanced)

Institutional Folios

For renewal of approved teacher education programs, the folio review process is utilized. The content of the folios shall respond to the statements and expectations found in the Teaching Standards section of the *Certification and Teacher Education Regulations* manual. The folio is a qualitative and quantitative description of the unit's programs. A single folio should be written for each program.

The following specific program information should be included in the program folio:

1. **Scope of the program**
Identify the name and endorsement level(s) of the program, type of program (basic or advanced), and list the objectives of the program.
2. **Program Requirements**
Give a complete listing of the courses and requirements for the program. List required courses, and describe any required competencies, skills, prerequisites, etc. that are required in addition to the coursework. Include descriptors of assessments, performance and other documentation that demonstrates how students are held accountable for the competencies and skills outlined in the program standards. A complete syllabus for each required content area course must be included in the folio. Do **not** include syllabi for courses that are not part of the approved program. See Appendix H for Course Syllabus Content Helpful to a Review Team and/or the Evaluation Review Committee (ERC).
3. **Program changes/discrepancies**
If there have been program changes since the catalog or other documents have been published which could create conflicting or confusing information for the folio team members, explain the changes and/or discrepancies. Include minutes of the meeting or a resulting memo which shows the date the unit approved any program changes.
4. **Response to Standards**
Provide a standard by standard response showing **how** each program meets the specific program standards (e.g., 91-1-90 Elementary, 91-1-91 English). Each standard should be typed followed by the response. In a matrix format, list the courses, specific assignments, activities or other requirements of the program which verify that the standard is met. In addition, a separate matrix not bound in the folio is helpful to team members. Examples of matrices can be found in Appendix I and J.

Items could include:

Course Syllabi (See Appendix H for Course Syllabus Content Helpful to a Review Team and/or the ERC)

Assignment Sheets

Evaluation Forms (e.g., field experience or student teaching)

Handouts

Exams

Textbook Table of Contents; **IF** material that is covered is clearly evident in the syllabus, highlighted in the table of contents, and signed by the professor

Teacher Education Handbook

Advising Forms

Field Experience Handbook(s) (optional)

Other Materials (optional)

5. Format

Include a table of contents and make certain to number each page of the folio. Hand numbering is acceptable.

Suggestions For Preparing Folios

Do's

Do have the unit head review, approve, and submit all folios including those from colleges/departments outside of education

Do respond from a factual perspective

Do justify your approach to meeting the standards especially if you use an approach that may not be the "norm;" the folio teams and Evaluation Review Committee (ERC) will not make a judgment on how you "package" your program

Do address prerequisite standards, such as general science, thoroughly

Don'ts

Don't try to rationalize/justify your program by objecting to or criticizing the standards

Don't respond from an emotional perspective

Other Suggestions:

1. Get an unbiased opinion: have an unbiased reader examine the folio for content, clarity, typos, etc. Someone from the college/university may serve in this role, but it would be even better to use someone from outside of the college/university.
2. Strike a balance between over-duplicating and under-duplicating. There is no need to mass produce lengthy documents, but provide a single copy for each folio review team and give a summary of important information in the folio with a reference to the full document.
3. Ask someone to "play" team member: have someone read your course syllabus and judge whether it documents that the specified standards are met.
4. Keep things simple: access to documents referenced in the folio should be simple and quick. Don't put confidential information such as student transcripts in the folio.

Staff members preparing the data in support of the unit's request for renewal of teacher education program approval are requested to be concise and specific. It is not necessary to repeat information which is available in catalogs, brochures, syllabi,

inventories, faculty schedules, handbooks, etc. However, when such materials are used, the points of reference should be designated.

Submitting Folios

Prior to the folio review date, institutions shall submit 5 copies of each program folio and enough copies of academic catalogs and other pertinent documentation (such as student teaching handbooks) to facilitate the review. The folios are due October 1 for Fall folio reviews and March 1 for Spring folio reviews and must be submitted to the Teacher Education Office at the Kansas State Department of Education, 120 SE 10th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612. **KSDE requires that folios be done well. Incomplete, ambiguous, or apparently inaccurate reports will be returned to the unit.**

Folio Review Team Members

After receiving a completed application, KSDE staff selects a review team. The review team consists of three persons with one designated as chair. Criteria for selection of team members include:

- a. KSDE Folio trained or KSDE/NCATE trained
- b. Area of expertise is, as nearly as possible, the same as the program being reviewed
- c. No conflict of interest. (See below for guidelines on conflict of interest)
- d. Not a member of the Evaluation Review Committee (ERC)

The list of team members will be sent to the unit several months before the scheduled visit. **A unit is allowed to challenge team members' assignments to serve on teams based on a conflict of interest only** (See Conflicts of Interest below). A unit challenge of team members must be submitted in writing to KSDE.

KSDE has a nominating process for selection and training of KSDE folio team members. Units interested in nominating individuals for folio review training should consult the *Teacher Education On-Site Evaluation Team Manual* or contact the Teacher Education Office of KSDE.

Conflicts of Interest

In some situations, clear-cut rules for conflict of interest may be difficult to establish. There are many cases where ethical judgments must be made according to the facts of a specific situation. The following guidelines are intended to provide credibility and objectivity by team members in conducting evaluations of programs.

Team members should avoid serving on teams for institutions at which they have close personal or professional relationships. Many individuals serving on teams know a large number of professionals throughout the state. The fact that someone is known does not automatically rule out the possibility of serving on a team. The key to this principle is *close personal or professional relationships*. Team members shall avoid serving at institutions if:

1. They hold an earned or honorary degree from the institution.
2. They have significant ties such as being members of a common consortium.
3. They are colleagues with whom they have jointly authored research or literature.
4. They have served on the faculty or staff at the institution.
5. An immediate family member is or was employed at the institution.
6. An immediate family member is or was a student at the institution.
7. There is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to an institution.
8. An individual has served as a consultant or advisor for assisting and preparing for an on-site visit within the past 10 years.

In these cases, personal prejudice is sometimes difficult to avoid and bias is often assumed by the institution whose programs are being reviewed.

Ethical Guidelines for Institutions

Institutions also have some ethical responsibilities related to the program approval process. KSDE has established the following guidelines for institutions:

1. Each institution shall facilitate a thorough and objective appraisal of their professional education units and programs by KSDE.
2. Institutions are allowed to challenge team members nominated to serve on teams based a conflict of interest only. The right to challenge cannot be employed as a process for selecting team members holding particular predispositions.
3. Institutional personnel shall refrain from publicly criticizing those individuals participating in the program approval process.
4. Institutions shall report any perceived inadequacies of the KSDE procedures or processes at the time of their occurrence, rather than withholding the information until after the Evaluation Review Committee takes action.

Folio Review Procedures

A copy of the program folio and supporting materials are sent to each team member for review. After reviewing the folio, each team member completes applicable compliance rating forms in preparation for the folio review meeting. The compliance rating form lists each of the standards for an individual program and has columns for the reviewer to note questions and comments regarding evidence that was found or lacking for each of the standards. (See Appendix K for a sample of a program compliance rating form.)

Folios are usually reviewed simultaneously at the KSDE. The teams typically meet on an evening and the following day to review the program folios. During this time, they compare and discuss their findings on the compliance rating forms, make a

judgment as to whether weaknesses or strengths exist in regard to the KSDE program standards, and prepare the team reports. The team chair is responsible for turning in the report to the teacher education section of KSDE prior to departing. If several institutions submit programs for the same endorsement area, a single team may examine all of these programs.

Two copies of the team report are submitted to appropriate representatives of the teacher education institution. Generally, the program report shall follow the format below:

COVER SHEET

- Includes the name of the institution and date the report was prepared.

TEAM ASSIGNMENTS

- List the names of the team members and the programs to which they were assigned.

PROGRAM REPORT

- Provides the following information:
 - A. Rationale for the Decision
Describes the team members' analysis of the program. This section should include illustrations or illuminators that helped determine whether weaknesses or strengths exist in regard to the KSDE program standards.
 - B. Weaknesses
Indicates specific areas of concern that the team determines should be addressed. Weaknesses must relate to a specific standard and should be specific enough to be helpful without being a recommendation.
 - C. Corrections to the Folio
Provides corrections and/or additions to the folio as needed.

The team report is the property of the institution. It can be released at the discretion of the institution. If portions of the report are released to the public, the institution should indicate that the full report is available from them. KSDE will not release the team report nor any parts of the team report without permission from the institution.

Institutional Rejoinder to the Team Report

The unit may respond and file supplemental materials pertinent to the facts and conclusions found in the team report. This response is called an Institutional

Rejoinder, and it must be submitted to the Teacher Education Office of the KSDE within 30 days of the date the unit receives the team report. The purpose of the rejoinder is to clarify information presented in the team report and to correct any factual errors in the report. If the judgments of the team members are being contested by the unit, the rejoinder must indicate the grounds for such a stand and the available documentation to support them. This information should be summarized, cited, and included in an appendix as appropriate.

The rejoinder should be concise, to the point, and complete. It should not include newly developed materials or evidence that did not exist prior to submission of the original folio. **The rejoinder should respond to all weakness cited in the team report.** If the unit agrees that a cited weakness is correct, the rejoinder **should acknowledge this fact.**

The following conditions must be adhered to as the Institutional Rejoinder is prepared by the unit:

- All evidence must describe what existed at the time of the folio review since the team report describes the program as submitted at the time of the review. Changes made by the unit after the folio review cannot be considered by the ERC or KSBE in their deliberations regarding program approval. Those changes must be reported as part of the unit's Annual Report.
- All evidence must relate directly to the standards and procedures that applied at the time of the folio review.
- The rejoinder must be factual in nature. All inaccurate information should be corrected and appropriate documentation should be submitted with the rejoinder.
- When the unit does not respond to the weaknesses in the team report, it will be assumed that the unit concurs with the team citation.

The Institutional Rejoinder should be paginated and include the following *four* sections:

1. Letter from the unit head acknowledging the receipt of the team report.
2. Response to the weaknesses cited by the team. If there is evidence to suggest that a weakness does not exist, the appropriate documentation should be appended.
3. Perceptions of procedural concerns, if any, regarding the program approval process that might have prejudiced the team judgments.
4. Appendices that support any requests for reconsideration of the team judgments.

NOTE: If the data were included in the Institutional Report and not given adequate consideration by the team, the appropriate pages should be reproduced and sent with the rejoinder. If the reference exceeds three pages in the program folio, the page numbers of the program folio should be cited and *not duplicated*. The appendices should be paginated and their sources (e.g., Faculty Handbook or program folio) clearly identified on each appendix item.

Upon completion of the Institutional Rejoinder:

- *Five* copies of the rejoinder shall be sent to the Teacher Education Section of the KSDE.
- The Institutional Rejoinder shall be submitted within 30 days of the receipt of the team report. When team reports are sent to a unit around vacation times, additional time to prepare the rejoinder will be allowed.

The team Program Folio Report, the Institutional Folio Rejoinder, and other applicable materials are submitted to the chair of the original folio review team with directions to do the following:

- a. Review the Institutional Folio Rejoinder to the standards and weaknesses for the assigned programs. Consult other team members as needed to make judgments about the removal of weaknesses.
- b. Prepare a revised Program Folio Report citing any remaining weaknesses and revise the rationale accordingly.

Copies of the revised Program Folio Report are submitted to appropriate representatives of the teacher education institution. No additional response is permitted.

Program Approval Decisions

The ERC reviews the final team reports. Institutional Reports, rejoinders, or other documents will be available for review at the ERC meeting. The ERC may modify the team report to bring consistency to its judgments across institutions.

Procedures for review are outlined in Appendix L. The ERC then prepares a written initial recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to each program. This initial recommendation shall be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the Commissioner of Education.

Within 30 days of the receipt of the initial recommendation of the ERC, the teacher education institution may submit a written request for a hearing to appeal the initial recommendation. This request must specify, in detail, the basis for the

appeal, including an identification of each item disputed. Hearing procedures are outlined in Appendix M.

After the 30 days or, if applicable, after the hearing, the ERC submits a written final recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the proposed program. The recommendation is submitted to the Commissioner and, if a hearing was held, to an appropriate representative of the teacher education unit. The Commissioner submits the final recommendation to the Kansas State Board of Education for its consideration and determination.

Program Approval Status

The status assigned to any teacher education program being renewed is *approved*, *approved with stipulation*, or *not approved*. Even though a program is approved, it may still be accompanied with statements of weaknesses. If weaknesses are cited, the unit is expected to address progress on those weaknesses in the Annual Report. If a program earns approved status, the approval is effective for five academic years.

Approved with stipulation status is assigned to renewed programs when critical deficiencies exist. These deficiencies shall be addressed during the stipulated time period and prior to being granted *approved* status. An Upgrade Report is required for programs granted *approved with stipulation* status.

For *not approved* programs, refer to Guidelines for Student Completion of Unapproved programs on pg. 17.

Upgrade Reports for Approved with Stipulation Programs

An Upgrade Report is due for each program approved with stipulation on October 1. The Upgrade Report for Renewed Programs with Stipulation should include the following format and content:

Section I Description of the Program

1. **Scope**
Identify the name and endorsement level(s) of the program, list the objectives of the program, and indicate whether the program is advanced or basic.
2. **Requirements**
Give a complete listing of the courses and requirements for the program. List required courses and electives, and describe any required competencies, skills, prerequisites, etc. that are required in addition to the coursework. Include a description of assessments, performance and other documentation that supports the program objectives.

3. **Program Evaluation**
Describe the procedures used to evaluate the program and the results of the evaluations.
4. **Weaknesses**
Describe the weaknesses that were cited at the time the program folio was reviewed, what changes have been made to correct the weaknesses and the result of the changes.

Section II Supporting Documentation Applicable to Revisions or Weaknesses

1. Minutes of meetings
2. Revised documents
3. Course syllabi
4. All documents that support the correction of weaknesses described under #4 above

Five copies of the Upgrade Report, along with five copies of the current college catalog are to be submitted to KSDE. Trained folio reviewers will complete a preliminary review of the Upgrade Report to determine if weaknesses should be removed based on the documentation submitted in the Upgrade Report. If critical deficiencies are not removed, the program will lose its approved status.

The folio reviewers will forward their findings along with the Upgrade Report to the ERC for its examination and analysis. After such examination and analysis, the ERC prepares a written initial recommendation regarding the status to be assigned to the program for the succeeding year or years. The recommendation includes a statement of the findings and conclusions of the ERC. The recommendation is submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education unit and to the Commissioner of Education for final action by the Kansas State Board of Education.

Guidelines For Student Completion Of Unapproved Programs

Students shall be allowed three, full, consecutive, regular semesters following the notification of final action by KSBE to complete a "Not Approved" program. Summers and interterms are not counted as part of the three semesters. Students who finish within this period may be recommended for licensure by the college or university.

The unit shall not recruit students for a "Not Approved" program and must remove all reference to the program from catalogs, handbooks, institutional brochures, and other publications.

Guidelines for Student Completion of Approved Programs When Unit Accreditation is Revoked

When an institution has its accreditation revoked, students will be allowed **no** additional semesters to complete approved programs at that institution. Students who complete their programs at the end of the semester in which revocation occurs may be recommended for licensure by the institution.

The institution may not recruit students for any program and must remove all reference to any programs from catalogs, handbooks, institutional brochures, and other publications. Courses taken at the institution while the unit is not accredited may not be used to meet licensure requirements.

Guidelines for Matching Accreditation and Program Approval Cycles

When an institution gains continuing accreditation status after a probationary review, ERC has the option to extend the expiration date of institutional programs to coincide with the next five-year, continuing accreditation cycle.

Action Letter and Report

A unit is notified of the approval status within ten business days after the KSBE meeting during which its case is reviewed. The KSBE communicates its action by a letter and an action report from the Commissioner of Education to the unit head. This action report indicates the status of all programs and weaknesses cited for any program reviewed at that time.

NEW PROGRAMS

The Self-Study

New programs must be approved by the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE) prior to being offered. Just as with unit accreditation and renewal of teacher education programs, a unit shall conduct a self-study to determine the viability of offering a new program. The resulting data shall be recorded in the folio, which becomes the major resource document for determining the approval status for a new program.

The self-study should include the rationale that speaks to the need for the new program and a formal examination that determines (a) the ability of the unit to carry out its responsibilities for the program and (b) the quality of the program under consideration. The unit should capitalize on its strengths and eliminate or reduce its weaknesses.

There are no specific requirements for the conduct of a self-study, but the involvement of the faculty with responsibility for the professional education courses, including those who teach methods courses, appears critical to a successful review. Collaboration with faculty in other supporting units (e.g., Arts and Sciences and the teaching content areas) is also essential to a successful self-study.

Folios for New Programs

Folios are an integral part of the initial approval of a teacher education program. Folios prepared for new programs are similar to those prepared for renewal of programs (See pg. 8-11). The content of the folio should respond to the statements and expectations found in the standards of the *Certification and Teacher Education Regulations*. The program folio is a qualitative and quantitative description of the unit's new program.

New programs may be submitted at any time; however, new programs submitted in the summer may be delayed due to inaccessibility of folio review team members. The Request for Initial Approval of Teacher Education Programs, Appendix N, *five* copies of the new program folio, and *five* copies of the college catalog must be submitted 12 months preceding the academic year in which the unit's program is to be operationalized. **KSDE requires that folios be done well. Incomplete, ambiguous, or apparently inaccurate reports will be returned to a unit and will delay the new program approval process.**

The following outline describes the three sections that should comprise the folio:

Section I Preliminary Information

1. Completed Request for Initial Approval of Teacher Education Programs form (See Appendix N for appropriate form).
2. Table of Contents.
3. Overview of the institution and program. This brief section shall describe the mission of the institution, special institutional characteristics, and other information that will help the reader understand the institution.

Section II Program Descriptions

Staff members preparing the data in support of the unit's request for initial approval of a teacher education program are requested to be concise and specific. It is not necessary to repeat information which is available in the catalog or other materials supplied by the institution. However, when such materials are used, the points of reference shall be designated in the folio and the materials made available.

The following outline shall be followed when preparing the folio for a new teacher education program:

Specific Program Information

1. **Scope**
Identify how the new program fits into and will be supported by the organizational structure of the unit. Describe the plan for implementation and operation of the program. Identify the name and endorsement level(s) of the program, and list the objectives of the program.
2. **Requirements**
Give a complete listing of the courses and requirements for the program. List required courses and electives, and describe any required competencies, skills, prerequisites, etc. that are required in addition to the coursework. Include descriptors of assessments, performance, and other documentation that supports the program objectives. A complete syllabus for each content area course must be included in the folio.
3. **Faculty**
Describe how adding the program will impact faculty load in education and content areas.
4. **Response to standards**
Provide a standard by standard response to applicable regulations showing how the program meets each standard of each regulation. This will include the specific program standards e.g., 91-1-90 Elementary, 91-1-91 English,

and if applicable, 91-1-141 Innovative and Experimental Programs. See pg. 10 for Suggestions for Preparing Folios. The response may include a list of courses and/or activities, a narrative description and items that help provide evidence that the standard is met.

Items could include:

Course Syllabi (See Appendix H for Course Syllabus Content Helpful to a Review Team and/or the ERC)
Assignment Sheets
Evaluation Forms (e.g., field experience or student teaching)
Handouts
Exams
Textbook Table of Contents; **IF** material that is covered is clearly evident in the syllabus, highlighted in the table of contents, and signed by the professor
Teacher Education Handbook
Advising Forms
Field Experience Handbook(s) (optional)
Other Materials (optional)

Each standard should be typed followed by the response. A matrix showing standards and coursework used to meet the standard is helpful. Examples of matrices can be found in Appendix I and J.

New Program Team Members

Upon receipt of a completed application, a team of three persons with one designated as chair, is selected by KSDE teacher education staff. Criteria for selection of team members include:

- a. KSDE folio trained
- b. Area of expertise is, as nearly as possible, the same as the proposed program
- c. No conflict of interest (See pgs. 11-12 for guidelines on conflict of interest)
- d. Not a member of the Evaluation Review Committee (ERC)

Folio Review Procedures for New Programs

A copy of the new program folio and supporting materials are sent to each team member for review. After reviewing the folio, each team member completes applicable compliance rating forms in preparation for the folio review meeting. The compliance rating form lists each of the standards for an individual program and has columns for the reviewer to note questions and comments regarding evidence that was found or lacking for each of the standards. (See Appendix K for a sample of a program compliance rating form.)

Folios are reviewed at a site determined by the chair of the team in consultation with team members. In regard to setting a date for the review of the new program, the chair is instructed to convene the team in a timely manner. Typically, the new program is reviewed and the report submitted to the institution

within 60 days of making the team assignment. During the review of the new program, the team members compare and discuss their findings on the compliance rating forms, make a judgment as to whether weaknesses or strengths exist in regard to the KSDE program standards, and prepare the team report. If several institutions submit new programs for the same endorsement area, a single team may examine the programs.

The team chair submits the new program report to KSDE. Two copies of the team report are submitted to appropriate representatives of the teacher education institution. Generally, the program report shall follow the format below:

COVER SHEET

- Includes the name of the institution, name of the program being reviewed, names of the team members, and date the report was prepared.

PROGRAM REPORT

- Provides the following information:
 - A. Rationale
Describes the team analysis of the program. This section should include illustrations or illuminators that helped determine the weaknesses and strengths in regard to the standards.
 - B. Weaknesses
Indicates specific areas of concern that the team determines should be addressed. Weaknesses must relate to a specific standard.
 - C. Corrections to the Folio
Provides corrections and/or additions to the folio as needed.

The team report is the property of the institution. It can be released at the discretion of the institution. If portions of the report are released to the public, the institution should indicate that the full report is available from them. KSDE will not release the team report nor any parts of the team report without permission from the institution.

Institutional Rejoinder to the Team Report

The unit may respond and file supplemental materials pertinent to the facts and conclusions found in the program report. This response is called an Institutional Rejoinder, and it must be submitted to the Commissioner of Education within 30 days of the date the unit receives the program report. The purpose of the rejoinder is to clarify information presented in the team report and to correct any factual errors in the report. If the judgments of the team members are being contested by the unit, the rejoinder must indicate the grounds for such a stand and the available

documentation to support them. This information should be summarized, cited, and included in an appendix as appropriate. The rejoinder should be concise, to the point, and complete. It should not include newly developed materials or evidence that did not exist prior to submission of the original folio. The conditions which must be adhered to when submitting a rejoinder to the team report for a new program are the same as those described in the Institutional Rejoinder section under Renewal of Approved Programs (See pg. 14-15). **If the unit submits an Institutional Rejoinder, it should respond to all weaknesses cited in the new program team report.** If the unit agrees that the cited weakness is correct, the rejoinder **should acknowledge this fact.** The Institutional Rejoinder is submitted to KSDE and forwarded to the team chair who revises the report accordingly.

Program Approval Decisions

The ERC reviews the final team reports. Institutional Reports, rejoinders, or other documents will be available for review at the ERC meeting. Procedures for review are outlined in Appendix L. The ERC then prepares a written initial recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the proposed program. This initial recommendation will be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the Commissioner of Education.

Within 30 days of the receipt of the initial recommendation of the ERC, the teacher education institution may submit a written request for a hearing to appeal the initial recommendation. This request must specify, in detail, the basis for the appeal, including an identification of each item disputed. Hearing procedures are outlined in Appendix M.

After the 30 days or, if applicable, after the hearing, the ERC submits a written final recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the proposed program to the Commissioner of Education and to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution. The Commissioner submits the final recommendation to the Kansas State Board of Education for its final action.

Action Letter and Report

A unit is notified of the approval status within ten business days after the KSBE meeting during which its case is reviewed. The KSBE communicates its action by a letter and an action report from the Commissioner of Education to the unit head. This action report indicates the status of all programs and weaknesses cited for any program.

Program Approval Status

Each new program may be *approved with stipulation* or *not approved*. When *approved with stipulation* status is assigned to a new program, the unit shall submit a **Progress Report** to the Commissioner within 60 days after completion of the second semester of operation of the program. Thereafter, progress shall be noted in the Annual Report until the next on-site visit. *Approved with stipulation* status for a

new program may be accompanied by statements of weaknesses. In its Progress Report, the unit will be expected to address progress on weaknesses, as well as present information on implementation and evaluation of the new program.

Not approved status prohibits a unit from initiating the proposed program. When a new program receives the *not approved* status, the unit will receive a report indicating the statements of weaknesses from KSBE.

New Program Procedures Following Initial Approval

If approved, the new program will be approved for two years. The teacher education unit must notify KSDE when the new program becomes operational (see definition below). If the new program is not operational within that two year period, the unit may request a one-year extension from the Evaluation Review Committee. If the new program is not operational by the expiration date of the extension, it must be resubmitted as a new program. The new program will be reviewed at the unit's next regularly scheduled on-site visit.

Operationalizing a program

A new program is considered to be operational if one or more students have declared that they are seeking the program as an endorsement for their teaching license and are currently enrolled in or have completed required program coursework. **The unit must notify the Teacher Education Coordinator of KSDE in writing when a program is operationalized.**

Progress Reports for New Programs

The Progress Report should include the following format and content:

Section I Description of the Program

1. **Scope**
Identify the name and endorsement level(s) of the program, list the objectives of the program, and indicate whether the program is advanced or basic.
2. **Requirements**
Give a complete listing of the courses and requirements for the program. List required courses and electives, and describe any required competencies, skills, prerequisites, etc. that are required in addition to the coursework. Include a description of assessments, performance and other documentation that supports the program objectives.
3. **Program Implementation and Evaluation**
Describe how many students were admitted and the date when the program was operationalized. Indicate how many students have been admitted to the program each semester thereafter. Describe how the curriculum was introduced and offered. Describe the procedures used to

evaluate the program and what changes occurred because of the evaluation process.

4. Weaknesses (if any)
Describe any weaknesses that existed at the time the new program folio was reviewed, what changes have been made to correct the weaknesses, and the result of the changes.

Section II Supporting Documentation Applicable to Revisions or Weaknesses

1. Minutes of meetings
2. Revised documents
3. Course syllabi
4. All documents or other written verification to demonstrate any critical deficiencies that have been corrected.

Five copies of the Progress Report, along with five copies of the current college catalog are to be submitted to the Commissioner of Education. The institution will receive a letter acknowledging receipt of the Progress Report. The Progress Report along with the information concerning the new program submitted on subsequent Annual Reports will be provided to the review team in preparation for review of the program at the unit's next on-site visit.

After the on-site visit, the team report on the new program will be submitted to the institution. The institution may submit a rejoinder to the ERC. The status assigned to any new program after an on-site visit is *approved*, *approved with stipulation*, or *not approved*. Even though a program is approved, it may still be accompanied with statements of weaknesses. If weaknesses are cited, the unit is expected to address progress on those weaknesses in the Annual Report. If approved, the new program will be approved through the expiration date of the currently approved programs which would allow the program to follow prescribed folio review procedure. *Approved with stipulation* status may be assigned to a program when critical deficiencies exist. These deficiencies shall be addressed during the stipulated time period and prior to being granted *approved* status. An Upgrade Report is required for programs granted approved with stipulation status. See pg. 16 for information on Upgrade Reports. For *not approved* programs, refer to Guidelines for Student Completion of Unapproved programs on pg. 17.

Innovative or Experimental Program Procedures

1. New innovative or experimental programs shall be approved by the Kansas State Board of Education prior to being offered. Regulations that guide the development of Innovative or Experimental programs can be found in Regulation 91-1-141 of the *Kansas Certification and Teacher Education Regulations*.
2. Programs shall be approved through the expiration date of currently approved programs. The teacher education unit must notify the Kansas State Board of Education when the new innovative or experimental program becomes

operational (see definition pg. 24). Yearly follow-up reports, whether operational or not, must be submitted in conjunction with the unit's Annual Report.

3. If the program is operational at the time of the next regularly scheduled on-site visit, an on-site review of the program shall be conducted. If the new program is not operational at the time of the next regularly scheduled on-site visit, it must be resubmitted as a new program.

Note: A unit may discontinue an innovative and experimental program at any time upon sending written notification of discontinuance to the Teacher Education Section of the KSDE.

4. If at the culmination of the initial required program timeline, the program still meets the definition of innovative or experimental, the unit may resubmit the program as innovative and experimental or may discontinue the program.
5. Innovative or experimental program proposals shall include all relevant required elements of traditional program proposals. To the degree the innovative or experimental program differs from standards in the *Kansas Certification and Teacher Education Regulations*, the unit shall include the following in the program proposal:
 - a. the rationale for the design and content of the innovative or experimental program
 - b. the rationale for why the program should not conform to the *Certification and Teacher Education Regulations*
 - c. documentation of systemic efforts to evaluate the graduates of the program
 - d. new programs should include proposed standards for evaluation of the innovative or experimental program
 - e. continuing innovative or experimental programs should include proposals for any changes in standards for evaluation and rationale for such changes.
6. Upon receipt of required materials provided by the unit, the new program is reviewed in accordance with new program procedures.

ANNUAL REPORTS

Each summer accredited professional education units are mailed the KSDE Annual Report form and if applicable, the Joint AACTE/NCATE Annual Report form. These must be completed by October 1 to maintain accreditation and approval of programs. KSBE and NCATE rely on these data to monitor the capability of units to continue programs of high quality. The Annual Report includes the following three forms:

Form A . . .

Requests basic institutional and unit information, including the name of the chief executive officer and unit head, levels of degrees, and type of institution. Most of this information is printed on the form and only needs to be checked for accuracy.

Form B . . .

Requests data on enrollment, number of graduates by program area, student characteristics, faculty and resources of the unit.

KSBE . . .

Requests a narrative response to changes that have occurred and evaluations that have been conducted over the past year. If applicable, the unit must report the progress that has been made in addressing program standards not met and weaknesses identified by the Kansas State Board of Education. The official list of weaknesses which must be addressed will be attached to the report form. The ERC reviews these reports on an annual basis.

These data allow KSBE to annually monitor the quality of the professional education programs. In the third year after an on-site review, KSBE reviews the data for evidence that program approval is still justified. See Appendix O for a sample of the "Third-Year Review of Annual Report Data." If the data suggests compelling reasons to question that KSBE's standards may no longer be met, a three-person team may be sent to the institution to collect appropriate data and prepare a report. Following that visit, KSBE in conjunction with the ERC determines whether program approval should continue.